

Sheryl

My comments on the draft FOST for Naval Hospital Long Beach, Parcel A are as follows:

1. Sheryl -- as an initial matter, I'd like to talk to you about whether CERCLA section 120(h)(3) has been triggered as a result of the storage (for one year or more), release or disposal of hazardous substances. The language in the draft FOST suggests that there have been no releases (incl. migration) of hazardous substances on Parcel A. However, since I am not familiar with the documentation in Section 1.2 of the FOST regarding environmental conditions on Parcel A, I want to discuss this issue with you. In addition, I want to talk to you about petroleum contamination on Parcel A and whether any of this contamination is attributable to waste oil, which is generally considered a CERCLA hazardous substance. As you will recall, we concluded that CERCLA section 120(h)(3) had been triggered in the case of Parcel B due to the storage of waste oil on this parcel.

2. Section 5.0, Page 4, paragraph beginning at the bottom of the page. The word "confirmational" is misspelled.

3. Section 5.0, pages 4-5. As a general comment, the paragraphs at the bottom of page 4 and top of page 5 should be rewritten to focus on conditions on Parcel A. Since this FOST addresses Parcel A, the emphasis in these paragraphs on Parcel B is confusing and raises numerous questions about Parcel A (see below). Parcel B should be discussed only to the extent that this discussion sheds light on conditions on Parcel A.

Section 5.0, top of Page 5. It is unclear from these paragraphs whether groundwater sampling was performed on both Parcel A and Parcel B or only on Parcel B. It is therefore unclear whether the sampling results (i.e. no detectable levels of btex) pertain to Parcel A, Parcel B or both. Since the text on the bottom of page 4 discusses a benzene plume associated with Parcel A, it appears that the above-referenced conclusions re nondetectable levels do not pertain to Parcel A (or at least not all of parcel A). The FOST should be revised to discuss conditions on Parcel A and to specifically address the benzene plume and any remediation thereof required by the RWQCB. The last paragraph of Section 5 suggests that no remediation of the benzene plume is required to protect human health and the environment, but this issue should be explicitly addressed. Are there any areas on Parcel A that are not defined as category 2 or 3?

Finally, It would be helpful to have a diagram showing the areas on Parcel A designated as category 2 and the areas designated as category 3 -- especially since these two "study areas" are discussed again in Section 10.0. This diagram should be cross-referenced here and in section 10.0. In addition, the cross-reference to Exhibit 6 should be expanded to explain that this exhibit sets forth the 7 categories into which property at

military bases may be classified.

by deletion
4. Section 6.1. The items in the list of environmental factors which pose no constraints are not always clearly described. For example, the third item in the list is "nuclear." Is this a reference to nuclear waste? If so, how is this different from radiological/mixed waste? Since the radionuclides set forth at 40 CFR 302.4, Appendix B are CERCLA hazardous substances whether or not they are "wastes," it would be advisable to list this item as "radionuclides." The fifth item in this list is "chemical weapon." Does this refer to chemical weapon waste or the chemical weapons themselves? Similar comment with respect to the seventh item, "bacteriological." Finally, please revise the next-to-last sentence of this paragraph to read as follows: "Conditions on the parcels adjacent to parcel A do not appear to have any adverse environmental impacts on Parcel A." The current text refers to "the size and scope of the adjacent environmental parcels."

Sheryl: Do the documents listed in Section 1.2 of the FOST support these conclusions re (i) factors that pose no constraints and (ii) environmental impact on Parcel A of conditions on adjacent parcels?

5. Sections 6.1.6, page 6. This paragraph should set forth the Navy's rationale for concluding that conditions on the commercial truck parking area will not have an adverse environmental impact on Parcel A.

6. Section 6.2, page 7. Revise the last line of this paragraph to read as follows: "will require remediation or will require specific restrictions in the proposed transfer."

deleted
7. Section 7.1, page 8. It is unclear whether the factors described in this section (historical/archaeological sites, floodplains, etc.) pose no constraints to transfer because these conditions are not present on Parcel A or because these conditions have been managed in some way. Perhaps this paragraph can be revised to read as follows: "The following environmental conditions are not present on Parcel A and therefore pose no constraints to transfer: ..." A separate sentence should address OSHA compliance status. *no longer applicable because Hospital is closed*

Notice is triggered but not relevant
8. Section 8.0, page 8. This section should briefly describe why CERCLA 120(h)(1) and 120(h)(3) have been triggered, i.e. the storage (for one year or more), release or disposal of hazardous substances on Parcel A. In addition, while EPA encourages notification regarding the presence of petroleum products, CERCLA sections 120(h)(1) and 120(h)(3) do not require such notification. Perhaps the following sentence can be added to this section: "In addition, the transferee will be provided with notice regarding the presence of petroleum products."

9. Section 10.0, page 9. With respect to Category 3 property, replace the second sentence with the following: "The study area

listed as DoD Environmental Condition Category 3 is suitable for transfer because storage, release, disposal and/or migration of hazardous substances or petroleum products has occurred, but at concentrations that do not require a removal or remedial action." As I pointed out at the end of comment #3, it would be useful to have a diagram that shows the areas of Parcel A that are classified as category 2 and those that are category 3. This diagram should be cross-referenced here. Exhibit 6 (describing the 7 property categories) should also be cross-referenced.

10. Exhibit 6, page 26. There is a typographical error in the descriptions of categories 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6. The word "mitigation" should be "migration."

120(h)(1) notice

120(h)(3) issues